Appendices

Appendix A: An Analysis of the Best Submissions for the Herman Goldstein Award for Excellence in Problem-Oriented Policing, 1993-1999

In 1993, the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) created an award program in conjunction with its annual Problem-Oriented Policing Conference (POP Conference). The award recognizes exemplary police projects that address community problems using a problem-oriented approach. The award was named in honor of Herman Goldstein. It is officially known as the Herman Goldstein Award for Excellence in Problem-Oriented Policing (hereinafter the Goldstein award).

A panel of police supervisors judged the submissions for the award in the first few years of the program. Since 1996, a panel of police practitioners and researchers has judged the submissions. I have been one of the judges since 1996.[167]

I read and analyzed the best submissions available to me. These comprised the project reports that were awarded top honors from 1993 to 1995, and all submissions that survived an initial screening by the award committee from 1996 to 1999. I analyzed a total of 100 projects. (I didn't set out to analyze 100 projects–it just happened to total to a nice round number, thereby greatly simplifying my calculations of percentages.) The total number of submissions for the award far exceeds the number I reviewed for this analysis. In recent years, the program has received approximately 90 submissions per year. This sample of projects is not representative of all submissions to the award program, but rather is representative of what the judges have deemed to be the best submissions. Accordingly, my conclusions do not necessarily reflect an assessment of the state of all problem-solving as it is currently being practiced, but rather reflect an assessment of the state of what is being submitted for recognition as high-quality work. Undoubtedly, there is other high-quality problem-oriented work undertaken by police agencies that, for a variety of reasons, is never submitted to any award program for recognition. The projects I analyzed, arranged by police agency, are listed below.

[167] *The judges from 1996 to 1999 have been Ron Clarke (criminal justice professor–Rutgers University, and chair of the committee), Gary Cordner (criminal justice professor–Eastern Kentucky University, and former police chief), Ron Glensor (deputy chief, Reno, Nev., Police Department; and adjunct professor–University of Nevada-Reno), Rana Sampson (police consultant; former public safety director–University of San Diego; former sergeant, New York City Police Department), Greg Saville (criminal justice research associate –University of New Haven, and former police constable at the Peel Regional Police in Ontario), and the author, Mike Scott (police consultant and former police chief). Since 1997, Nancy La Vigne (National Institute of Justice) has also been a judge. In 1996, Karen Lea (sergeant, St. Petersburg, Fla., Police Department) served as a judge.*

Project Title	Police Agency	Year
1. Chronic Truancy Abatement Program	Baltimore Police Department	1999
2. Operation Cease-Fire	Boston Police Department	1998
3. San Juan Del Centro Housing Complex	Boulder , Colo., Police Department	1996
4. Electric Avenue	Calgary, Alberta, Police Service	1994
5. Apartment Watch	Calgary Police Service	1996
6. Carolwood Park Apartments	Carol Stream, Ill., Police Department	1997
7. ABC Enforcement Efforts	Charlotte-Mecklenburg, N.C., Police Dept.	1999
8. Gill Park Project	Chicago Police Department	1997
9. Raby Rebels Youth Project	Cleveland, England, Police	1998
10. Hartlepool School Watch Scheme	Cleveland, England, Police	1999
11. Apartment Managers' Hotline Program	Colorado Springs, Colo., Police Department	1998
12. Mario's Market	Delray Beach, Fla., Police Department	1996
13. The Elite Arcade	Delta, British Columbia, Police Department	1997
14. San Jacinto Park Renovation Action Plan	El Paso, Texas, Police Department	1996
15. Quality Neighborhoods Program	Fairfield, Calif., Police Department	1997
16. Transient Enrichment Network	Fontana, Calif., Police Department	1998
17. Domestic Violence Revictimization Prevention	Fremont, Calif., Police Department	1997
18. El Dorado Park "Stone Soup" Partnership	Fresno, Calif., Police Department	1996
19. Group Homes	Fresno Police Department	1996
20. Local Ordinances and Conditional-Use Permits: The Empowerment of Law Enforcement	Fresno Police Department	1997
21. Child Custody Disputes and Court Order Violations	Fresno Police Department	1999
22. Blue Hole Park Project	Georgetown, Texas, Police Services Division	1995
23. Theft Reduction Auto Program	Glendale, Ariz., Police Department	1997
24. Day Laborer Project	Glendale, Calif., Police Department	1997
25. Street Sweeping, Broadway Style	Green Bay, Wisc., Police Department	1999
26. District 4 Thefts From Rental Vehicles	Honolulu Police Department	1998
27. Methacathinone Laboratories	Indiana State Police	1997
28. Center Court Apartments	Joliet, Ill., Police Department	1996
29. Conflict Resolution in Farragut School	Joliet Police Department	1996
30. Black Tiger Karate Studio	Joliet Police Department	1997
31. Creston Apartments	Kansas City, Mo., Police Department	1994
32. Vehicle Accident Reduction Plan	Kansas City, Mo., Police Department	1997
33. The M.A.N.E.R.S. Project	Lancashire, England, Constabulary	1999
34. Mission: Mission Lake Plaza	Lauderhill, Fla., Police Department	1996
35. Northfields Project	Leicestershire, England, Constabulary	1999
36. Mental Evaluation Team	Long Beach, Calif., Police Department	1999
37. Virgil/Burns Area	Los Angeles Police Department	1993
38. Hollywood-Area Domestic Violence	Los Angeles Police Department	1996
39. Speeding in West Division	Los Angeles Police Department	1996
40. Harbor Area's Gateway Neighborhood Recovery Project	Los Angeles Police Department	1997
41. MacArthur Park Revitalization Project	Los Angeles Police Department	1998

Project Title	Police Agency	Year
42. 1100 Block, 59th Place	Los Angeles Sheriff's Department	1997
43. Tourist-Oriented Police Program	Metro-Dade, Fla., Police Department	1996
44. Escort Services	Metropolitan Bureau of Investigation, Fla.	1997
45. Fifth District, Levis Street	Metropolitan D.C. Police Department	1997
46. Hawthorne Huddle	Minneapolis Police Department	1999
47. Damascus Gardens	Montgomery County, Md., Police Department	1996
48. Dilapidated House in Oceanside, Long Island	Nassau County, N.Y., Police Department	1996
49. Crimes Against the Elderly	Nassau County Police Department	1998
50. Roosevelt Avenue Project (Anti-Prostitution Effort)	National City, Calif., Police Department	1997
51. The R.A.I.D. Squad Initiative	New Zealand Police	1998
52. PRIDE Program	Newport News, Va., Police Department	1998
53. The Barrow Temperance Project of Public Safety	North Slope Borough, Alaska, Department	1995
54. Tiffany Gardens and Western Hills Apartment Complexes	Overland Park, Kan., Police Department	1998
55. The Last-Drink Program	Peel, Ontario, Regional Police Service	1996
56. Turner-Fenton	Peel Regional Police Service	1996
57. Nightclub Problems	Phoenix Police Department	1997
58. Angela/Chanslor Area	Pomona, Calif., Police Department	1999
59. Whitfield Towne Apartments	Prince George's County, Md., Police Dept.	1998
60. Stop Break	Queensland, Australia, Police	1999
61. The Power of Partnerships	Racine, Wisc., Police Department	1999
62. North Side Redondo Gang	Redondo Beach, Calif., Police Department	1996
63. Graffiti Task Force	Richmond, Va., Police Department	1999
64. Vanier Project	Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Quebec	1996
65. Auto Theft	Royal Canadian Mounted Police, British Columbia	1997
66. New Helvetia and River Oaks	Sacramento, Calif., Police Department	1996
67. Prostitution Restraining Order Program	San Bernardino, Calif., Police Department	1999
68. Drag Racing	San Diego Police Department	1996
69. Pallet Project	San Diego Police Department	1996
70. The 501 Blues: The La Fripe International Project	San Diego Police Department	1996
71. Auto Theft	San Diego Police Department	1997
72. Macho's Nightclub Project	San Diego Police Department	1997
73. Start Smart	San Diego Police Department	1997
74. Mission Valley River Preserve	San Diego Police Department	1998
75. Operation Hot Pipe, Smokey Haze and Rehab	San Diego Police Department	1998
76. San Diego Traffic Offender Program (S.T.O.P.)	San Diego Police Department	1998
77. San Ysidro Boulevard	San Diego Police Department	1998
78. Truancy Control Project	San Diego Police Department	1999

Project Title	Police Agency	Year
79. Lewd Conduct at San Elijo Lagoon and I-5 Viewpoint	San Diego Sheriff's Department	1996
80. Harbor Plaza	Santa Ana, Calif., Police Department	1993
81. Street Cruising	Santa Ana Police Department	1997
82. Dennis Palmer Elk's Lodge	Santa Barbara, Calif., Police Department	1996
83. Options, Choices and Consequences	Seattle Police Department	1996
84. West First Revitalization Project	Spokane, Wash., Police Department	1997
85. 911 Abuse	St. Petersburg, Fla., Police Department	1996
86. Project Respect	St. Petersburg Police Department	1996
87. Prostitution	St. Petersburg Police Department	1997
88. Repeat Alcoholic Offenders in Downtown St. Petersburg	St. Petersburg Police Department	1997
89. Unsolved Homicides	St. Petersburg Police Department	1997
90. Eighth Street	Temple, Texas, Police Department	1996
91. South Florida Seaports Internal Conspiracy Project	U.S. Customs Service, Fla.	1997
92. Stop Stick Project	U.S. Customs Service, Texas	1997
93. Perception of High Crime on Campus	University of Alabama-Birmingham Police	1996
94. UW Police Response to Alcoholic Vagrants	University of Wisconsin-Madison Police	1997
95. Intersecting Solutions	Vancouver, British Columbia, Police Dept.	1999
96. South Central Prostitution Project	Wichita, Kan., Police Department	1996
97. 21st Street Community Renovation Strategy	Wichita Police Department	1997
98. Spectator's Club Project	Wichita Police Department	1998
99. Hilltop Community Project	Wichita Police Department	1999
100.Tropicana Motel	Yuma, Ariz., Police Department	1998

Table 1 lists the number of projects I analyzed for each year.

Table 1

Year	No. of Projects
1993	2
1994	2
1995	2
1996	30
1997	30
1998	17
1999	17
Total	**100**

Note: *Beginning in 1998, the committee decided to reduce the number of submissions to be reviewed by the entire committee (to approximately 15). They felt this better reflected the differing levels of quality of the submissions and permitted the judges to review the best submissions more carefully.*

I entered the following information from each project report into a simple database program:

a. year of submission,
b. title of project,
c. name of police agency,
d. state or province of police agency,
e. country and region of police agency,
f. type of police agency,
g. nature of problem in terms of behavior,
h. nature of problem in terms of place,
i. nature of problem in terms of people involved,
j. nature of problem in terms of time or event,
k. scope of problem,
l. type of responses used to address problem-oriented policing,
m. references to "zero tolerance,"
n. references to "restorative justice,"
o. references to "crime prevention through environmental design,"
p. position of project leader,
q. position type of project leader, and
r. level of recognition in award program.

These data allowed me to analyze the following questions about observable trends among the best submissions to the award program:

a. Where are the best submissions coming from? Which agencies? Which states, provinces or countries? What types of agencies?

b. What types of problems are the police addressing? In what terms do police define problems? What is the scope of the problems the police are addressing? Who is leading the projects?

c. What types of responses are police using to address problems? How often are certain popular response types used?

These are questions of interest to me in assessing observable trends over time in the Goldstein award program. I did not capture detailed information about the methods used to identify, analyze and assess problems, though that information is surely of great interest to others.

This survey of the 100 best submissions to the Goldstein award program from 1993 to 1999 is, of course, limited in scope and methodology. Even the best submissions to the program do not necessarily reflect the best of problem-oriented policing. In my own travels, I have visited a number of police agencies that have claimed to be engaged in problem-oriented policing routinely and for several years, yet that have seldom, if ever, submitted project reports to the

program. It takes time and effort to prepare the submissions, and not all police officials are prepared to make that investment. There may also be good crime prevention initiatives occurring in which the police are only tangentially involved. Reports of those initiatives also might not find their way into the program. And, as noted earlier, problem-solving efforts from non-English-speaking countries usually are not translated for the program. These qualifications aside, I would nonetheless argue that the 100 projects I reviewed represent an important portion of the total amount of problem-oriented police work occurring. Allowing for some errors in judgment by the program judges, these 100 projects generally represent the best of the work submitted to the program.

As to the limits of my methodology, I concentrated more on the nature of the problems addressed and the responses to those problems than I did on such other important steps in problem-solving as problem analysis and assessment. I will reserve that for future work. I reviewed only the project reports submitted to the program, reports that are limited in length by the program rules. I did not interview the problem-solvers or review supporting materials not submitted to the program, though doing so would surely improve an understanding of the work actually done. I classified elements of the projects in terms that make sense to me, though not according to any widely accepted analysis framework. Finally, I did not solicit any independent review of the projects to control for my own biases and errors.

So what conclusions, however tentative and qualified, do I draw from a review of these best efforts? I offer the following summary conclusions, followed by a more detailed description of my findings related to each of my research questions.

Summary of Conclusions

a. The range of response alternatives used is the best aspect of problem-oriented policing being demonstrated in the Goldstein award program. The police continue to frequently use the criminal justice system, but usually more selectively and in conjunction with alternative responses. The police are willing to use informal and noncoercive response alternatives in addition to formal and coercive measures. This positive development is tempered in more recent years by increased resort to stock responses such as "zero tolerance" and "crime prevention through environmental design," responses that may be sensible, but that too often are crudely applied.

b. Problem-solving initiatives usually use a combination of response types to address problems. Multiple interventions, while

complicating efforts to determine causes and effects, usually address problems more effectively than single strategy responses.

c. Problem analysis remains generally weak, with most analysis serving merely to substantiate the existence of the suspected problem rather than to develop a more insightful understanding of why it is occurring.

d. Assessment of response effectiveness is typically cursory, lacking in precision and certainty, although this aspect of problem-solving is improving, with greater attention being paid to such matters as control groups and displacement effects.

e. Inadequate research resources are being dedicated to problem-oriented policing. Research expertise, technology and funding remain in scarce evidence in the Goldstein award projects.

f. Police executives and mid-level managers are conspicuously absent from many good problem-solving initiatives. The good work of line-level police officers would likely (though not certainly) be improved by stronger involvement of higher-ranking officials in the process.

g. Overall, most of the best submissions to the Goldstein award program come from the southwestern part of the United States, especially from southern and central California. There are high-quality efforts from other regions, but no other region produces the same amount of high-quality projects. Some states with large populations, as well as some police agencies reputed to be engaged in problem-oriented policing or community policing, are conspicuously absent from representation in the program.

h. Problems ranging from serious crimes to nuisances, disorder and accidents are addressed using problem-oriented policing methods. This contradicts some claims that problem-oriented policing is applied only to lower-level disorder problems, and not to serious crime problems.

i. Problem-solving initiatives addressed problems ranging from highly localized ones to those affecting entire communities. In fact, there were more of the latter than the former. This contradicts some claims that problem-oriented policing addresses problems that are only limited in scope. The level of analysis and response to communitywide problems, however, seldom matched the scope of the problem.

Detailed Findings

Where Are the Best Submissions Coming From?

The Goldstein award program is open to police agencies throughout the world. Because the program is run by PERF, a predominantly, though not exclusively, American organization, most submissions come from U.S. police agencies.[168] Due to language barriers, all submissions have come from English-speaking countries (including the bilingual province of Quebec), even though problem-oriented policing is practiced in non-English-speaking countries. Table 2 shows from which countries the best submissions have come.

Table 2
Goldstein Award Submissions, by Country

Country	No./Pct.
United States	86
Canada	8
United Kingdom	4
New Zealand	4
Australia	4

Of those projects submitted by U.S. police agencies, the majority (58%) were submitted by agencies in what I defined as the southwestern region of the country,[169] with 41 percent coming from California alone (see Tables 3 and 4 on the next page). There are several possible explanations for this trend. The award program is closely linked with PERF's POP Conference. The award solicitations are sent out in conjunction with announcements about the conference, and the awards are presented at the conference. Since its inception in 1990, the POP Conference has been held in San Diego and cohosted by the San Diego Police Department. If for no other reason than logistics, police officials from southern California and surrounding regions have attended the conference in greater numbers than have those from other parts of the country. The San Diego Police Department is recognized as a leader in the practice of problem-oriented policing, and has exercised this influence worldwide, but especially in the Southwest region of the United States. It is also possible that the preponderance of the best submissions' coming from the Southwest reflects, in a general way, the high caliber of police personnel and management typically found in this part of the country. I don't know which of these factors best explains this trend, but it is perhaps the most obvious observable trend about the award. Table 3 lists the breakdown of U.S. submissions by region, as well as the total percentage of submissions each region supplied. Table 4 does the same, by state.

[168] *The United Kingdom has recently started a new award program to recognize problem-oriented policing there. It is known as the Tilley award, in honor of Professor Nick Tilley of Nottingham Trent University, widely recognized as one of the premier experts in problem-oriented policing in the United Kingdom. In coming years, the Tilley award program may draw away from the Goldstein award program submissions from the United Kingdom, although that isn't certain.*

[169] *I categorized the states into the following six regions:*
Northeast: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont
Mid-Atlantic: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia
Southeast: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee
Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin
Southwest: Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah
Northwest: Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming

Table 3
Goldstein Award Submissions From the United States, by Region of United States

Region	No.	Pct.
Southwest (Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah)	50	58
Southeast (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee)	12	14
Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin)	12	14
Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia)	6	7
Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont)	3	3
Northwest (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming)	3	3

Table 4
Goldstein Award Submissions From the United States, by State

State	No.	Pct.
California	35	41
Florida	10	12
Illinois	5	6
Kansas	5	6
Texas	4	5
Arizona	3	3
Maryland	3	3
Wisconsin	3	3
Colorado	2	2
Missouri	2	2
New York	2	2
Virginia	2	2
Washington	2	2
Alabama	1	1
Alaska	1	1
District of Columbia	1	1
Hawaii	1	1
Indiana	1	1
Massachusetts	1	1
Minnesota	1	1
North Carolina	1	1
Total	**86**	**97**

Note: *Percentages do not total to 100 due to rounding.*

That so many submissions come from California may be explained by the factors mentioned above. Other states are clearly underrepresented (or not represented at all) in the program. The San Diego Police Department is the source of more of the best submissions than any other single police agency (see Table 5).

Table 5
Goldstein Award Submissions, by Agency

Agency	No./Pct.
San Diego Police Department	11
Los Angeles Police Department	5
St. Petersburg Police Department	5
Fresno Police Department	4
Wichita Police Department	4
Joliet Police Department	3
Calgary Police Service	2
Cleveland, England, Police	2
Kansas City, Mo., Police Department	2
Nassau County Police Department	2
Peel Regional Police	2
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	2
Santa Ana Police Department	2
U.S. Customs Service	2
Baltimore Police Department	1
Boston Police Department	1
Boulder Police Department	1
Carol Stream Police Department	1
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department	1
Chicago Police Department	1
Colorado Springs Police Department	1
Delray Beach Police Department	1
Delta Police Department	1
El Paso Police Department	1
Fairfield Police Department	1
Fontana Police Department	1
Fremont Police Department	1
Georgetown Police Services Division	1
Glendale, Ariz., Police Department	1
Glendale, Calif., Police Department	1

Green Bay Police Department	1
Honolulu Police Department	1
Indiana State Police	1
Lancashire Police	1
Lauderhill Police Department	1
Leicestershire Constabulary	1
Long Beach Police Department	1
Los Angeles Sheriff's Department	1
Metro-Dade Police Department	1
Metropolitan Bureau of Investigation	1
Metropolitan Police Department	1
Minneapolis Police Department	1
Montgomery County Police Department	1
National City Police Department	1
New Zealand Police	1
Newport News Police Department	1
North Slope Borough Department of Public Safety	1
Overland Park Police Department	1
Phoenix Police Department	1
Pomona Police Department	1
Prince George's County Police Department	1
Queensland Police	1
Racine Police Department	1
Redondo Beach Police Department	1
Richmond Police Department	1
Sacramento Police Department	1
San Bernardino Police Department	1
San Diego Sheriff's Department	1
Santa Barbara Police Department	1
Seattle Police Department	1
Spokane Police Department	1
Temple Police Department	1
University of Alabama-Birmingham Police Department	1
University of Wisconsin-Madison Police Department	1
Vancouver Police Department	1
Yuma Police Department	1
Total	**100**

The best submissions are predominantly from municipal police agencies (see Table 6).

Table 6
Goldstein Award Submissions, by Type of Police Agency

Type of Agency	No./Pct.
Municipal	75
County	9
Regional	8
Federal	4
Campus	2
State	2
Total	**100**

What Types of Problems Are the Police Addressing?

One can identify problems in various ways, and Herman Goldstein recommends that the police do so in whatever way best characterizes the specific situation being addressed. As a general proposition, one can define problems in terms of the offensive behavior, the location, the people involved, or the time or event during which the situation occurs. Accordingly, I classified the 100 projects according to this general framework. I tried to capture the way the project reporters described each problem. In all cases, the project reporters could readily classify the problem being addressed in terms of the offensive behavior. In fewer instances was the location, people involved or time/event central to how the project reporters defined the problem. This analysis reflects as much how problem-solvers define problems as what behaviors, locations, people, and times/events are involved in problem-solving initiatives.

Problems, by Behavior

Table 7 on page 103 shows the types of problems addressed in the projects in terms of behavior, and is further organized by my own categorization of generic problem types (traffic-related, drug-related, alcohol-related, intimidation/fear, fire-related, sex offenses, assault, deadly assault, stealing, disorder/disturbances, other deadly behavior, environmental crimes/disorder, youth-related, and miscellaneous).

My generic categories are not mutually exclusive. For example, the problem of sexual assault, which I placed along with other sex offenses, can also be defined as a nondeadly assault problem. In most instances, I classified the problem in precisely the terms reported in the submissions; in other instances, I modified the description slightly to fit into an existing category. Most submissions described the problem in reasonably specific terms, although some described it in more general terms, which I captured by such labels as "general crime" or "neighborhood deterioration." Describing a problem in such generic terms is not all that helpful from a problem-oriented perspective, but I did so when there was no more-specific characterization of the problem behavior. Most submissions described several discrete problem behaviors within the context of a problem-solving project. Some submissions described the project in terms of a single problem behavior, while others described as many as 14 discrete problem behaviors.

This analysis provides a rough indication of the types of problems being addressed in the best projects. The most common problem was "drug dealing," followed by "assault," "prostitution," "vandalism," "theft," "disorderly conduct," and "loitering." The generic categories of "stealing" and "drug-related" were the largest.

Table 7
Problem Types, by Behavior

Problem Type, by Behavior	No.
Stealing	**57**
Thefts	13
Robberies	12
Burglaries	11
Auto thefts	9
Thefts from autos	5
Fraud	3
Carjacking	1
Fencing of stolen property	1
Telephone fraud	1
Theft of metal	1
Drug-Related	**40**
Drug dealing	34
Public drug use	3
Drug smuggling	2
Drug manufacturing	1
Intimidation/Fear	**38**
Loitering	13
Intimidation	8
Panhandling	6
Extortion	3
Fear of crime	3
Shots fired	2
Bias crime	1
Harassment	1
Window washing (squeegee)	1
Miscellaneous	**35**
Vandalism	14
General crimes	12
Trespassing	7
Mental illness-related problem	1
Public health	1

Assault (nonsexual, nondeadly)	**33**
Assaults	21
Fights	7
Domestic violence	5
Disorder/Disturbance	**27**
Disorderly conduct	13
Noise	7
Disturbances	3
Crowd disorder	1
Domestic disturbances	1
Juvenile disorder	1
Vagrancy	1
Deadly Assault	**26**
Shootings	12
Homicides	10
Drive-by shootings	2
Domestic homicide	1
Stabbing	1
Traffic-Related	**25**
Motor vehicle accidents	6
Parking	5
Drunken driving	4
Speeding	3
Traffic complaints	2
Cruising	1
Drag racing	1
Illegal public transportation (wildcatting)	1
Traffic congestion	1
Unlicensed driving	1
Environmental Crime/Disorder	**24**
Graffiti	11
Litter	9
Illegal dumping	2
Environmental waste dumping	1
Vehicle dumping	1
Sex Offenses	**23**
Prostitution	17
Sexual assaults	3
Escort service (prostitution)	1
Indecent exposure	1
Public sexual activity	1

Alcohol-Related	**15**
Public intoxication	4
Underage drinking	4
Public drinking	3
Alcohol-related offenses	2
Alcohol incapacitation	1
Sale of alcohol to minors and intoxicated people	1
Youth-Related	**7**
Truancy	4
Child custody dispute	1
Missing children	1
Runaway	1
Fire-Related	**3**
Arson	1
Explosion	1
Fire hazard	1
Other Deadly Behavior	**3**
Suicides	2
Drowning	1

Problems, by Place

While project reporters could characterize all the problems in terms of behavior, they did not define all the problems in terms of place. Ten of the projects did not lend themselves to description by place, largely because the problem occurred in various places throughout the affected community. Table 8 lists the types of places for the 90 projects in which the problem locations were specific. For 17 projects, the project reporters defined the problem, at least in part, as one of neighborhood decline or decay; that is, the general deterioration of a neighborhood was at least part of the problem to be addressed.

Table 8
Problems, by Place

Place Type	No.
Apartment complex	12
Commercial strip/district	10
Residential neighborhood	10
Licensed liquor establishment	6
Park	6
Roadway	6
School	6
Mixed-use neighborhood	4
Nightclub	4
Urban neighborhood	3
Border crossing	2
Riverbed	2
Shopping mall	2
Airport	1
Apartment building	1
Car dealership	1
Clandestine drug laboratory	1
College campus	1
Dilapidated house	1
Entertainment district (bars, clubs, taverns)	1
Indian reservation	1
Karate studio	1
Motel	1
Port	1
Recreation area	1
Group home	1
Retail clothing store	1
Video arcade	1

Problems, by People Involved

As with place, the project reporters did not define all problems in terms of the people involved. Obviously, there are people involved in or affected by every problem, but project reporters defined the problem in terms of people in only 59 of the submissions. For example, although 17 submissions cited prostitution as a problem, only three defined prostitutes themselves as the focus of the problem. Table 9 shows the categories of people who were the focus of the problem-solving efforts. The predominant category was "gangs."

Table 9
Problems, by People Involved

People Involved	**No.**
Gangs	26
Transients	7
Juvenile offenders	5
Students	4
Chronic alcoholics	3
Prostitutes	3
Car enthusiasts (hot-rodders, cruisers)	2
Merchants	2
Tourists	2
Day laborers	1
Drug couriers	1
Elderly victims	1
Indian youths	1
Homosexual men	1
Mentally ill people	1
Port employees	1
Domestic violence victims	1

Problems, by Time/Event

Project reporters defined few problems by time or event. Only five of the 100 projects lent themselves to a temporal definition. Of those five, three related to the times when schools were in or out of session, one to bar closing hours and one to postgame victory celebrations. In addition to place and people, most problems also have some sort of temporal dimension, but the police officials leading the initiatives rarely used the time/event element as a way to organize their thinking about the problem.

What Is the Scope of the Problems the Police Are Addressing?

I classified each project in terms of the scope of the problem-solving initiative. By scope, I refer to the extent to which the problem affected the entire community. I classified each problem as either "localized," "intermediate" or "communitywide" in scope. "Localized" problems typically affected a single residence, building, intersection, etc. "Intermediate" problems typically affected an entire apartment complex or neighborhood. "Communitywide" problems affected the police agency's entire jurisdiction (or, in some instances, just the entire jurisdiction of an agency subunit). These are rough categories and, accordingly, provide only a rough estimate of the scope of problems high-quality projects are addressing. Table 10 lists the number of projects in each category.

Table 10
Projects, by Scope

Scope of Problem	No./Pct.
Localized	21
Intermediate	47
Communitywide	32
Total	**100**

Somewhat surprisingly, almost one-third of the projects addressed problems affecting the entire community. I found it interesting that, despite the fact that problem-solvers quite often identified problems of considerable scope, the level of resources the agencies dedicated to researching and responding to those problems seldom matched the scope; that is, quite often, problem-solving officers and supervisors found themselves trying to address large problems without the benefit of a lot of research assistance or substantial resources. Table 11 reports the level of police leadership for each scope of problem, and partially confirms this conclusion. Only 17 percent of the submissions reported significant command-level leadership (typically, lieutenant and above). Line officers led almost one-half of the projects (47%). In 38 percent of the communitywide projects, line officers alone provided the leadership. Command-level officers more typically provided direct leadership on intermediate-scope projects (in nine of the 47 reported). Line officers' being listed as project leaders does not mean that supervisors and commanders were disinterested in the projects or did not provide indirect leadership and support, but only that they did not provide direct oversight and were not closely engaged in the project.

Table 11
Scope of Problems, by Level of Police Leadership

	Level of Police Leadership				
	Number (Percentage of Row)				
Scope of Problem	**Line**	**Supervisor**	**Command**	**Support**	**Row Total**
Localized	13 (62)	6 (29)	2 (10)	0 (0)	21
Intermediate	22 (47)	15 (32)	9 (19)	1 (2)	47
Communitywide	12 (38)	14 (44)	6 (19)	0 (0)	32
Column Total	**47**	**35**	**17**	**1**	**100**

Looking more specifically at the types of assignments of the officers leading the projects, I found that about one-half of them were assigned to some sort of specialized unit, or had assignments of which community policing or problem-solving was the defining feature. [Project reporters variously referred to these officers as community policing officers (or teams or units), neighborhood police officers, problem-oriented policing units (or POP teams), task forces, or some variation thereof.] About one-fourth of the projects had leadership from officers (including supervisors and commanders) in general patrol assignments. Detective and administrative officers exercised far less leadership. Table 12 lists the project leadership, by type of assignment.

Table 12
Project Leadership, by Type of Assignment

Type of Assignment	**No.**
Community policing, problem-oriented policing, neighborhood, task force, etc.	46
General patrol	26
Detective or special investigative unit	6
Drug or vice unit or officer	5
Traffic or DUI unit	5
Administrative command	3
Crime prevention	3
Police chief	3
School officer	2
Unknown	2

Note: The numbers do not add up to 100, as some projects had multiple leaders working from multiple assignments.

What Types of Responses Are Police Using To Address Problems?

The submissions reported a wide array of specific responses to problems. This was expected, given the range of types of problems addressed, and entirely consistent with Goldstein's insistence that police carefully tailor responses to the specific problem. To make some sense of the range of responses, I identified each specific response reported in the submissions, and classified each response according to the descriptive response categories Goldstein developed in *Problem-Oriented Policing* (1990: 104-141). Goldstein described 11 general categories of responses (three of which have multiple

subcategories). These 11 categories, along with some specific examples of each, are listed below, along with the number of projects in which the police used the particular response. (Goldstein's categories are listed below followed by specific examples drawn from the 100 submissions. The number in categories with multiple subcategories can total to more than 100; otherwise, the number also reflects the percentage of projects for which the particular response was reported.)

Alternative Response Categories in Problem-Oriented Policing

1. Concentrating Attention on Those Who Account for a Disproportionate Share of a Problem (25)

    - Repeat-offender/career-criminal initiatives
    - Repeat-victimization initiatives
    - Repeat-location initiatives

2. Connecting With Other Government and Private Services (65)

a. Making Referrals to Other Agencies (10)

    - Counseling and shelter for domestic violence victims
    - Support services for rape victims
    - Dispute resolution for landlords and tenants
    - Counseling and shelter for runaways
    - Demolition of buildings
    - Investigations of child abuse/neglect

b. Coordinating Police Responses With Other Agencies (33)

    - Joint monitoring of probationers and parolees
    - Joint truancy enforcement with schools and juvenile authorities
    - Joint alcohol licensing inspection and enforcement
    - Joint driver's license inspection and enforcement

c. Correcting Inadequacies in Municipal Services, and Pressing for New Services (22)

    - Increased garbage collection and forestry services
    - Increased recreational activities and facilities
    - Increased enforcement of building code and zoning violations
    - Improved street lighting
    - Improved public health services
    - Improved transportation systems

- Creation of refugee assistance facilities
- Creation of graffiti removal programs
- Creation of detoxification facilities
- Creation of job training programs
- Creation of system for checking on the welfare of the elderly

3. Using Mediation and Negotiation Skills (5)

- Landlord-tenant disputes
- Merchant-customer disputes
- Neighbor disputes
- Labor-management disputes
- Gang disputes
- Political protests
- Negotiations about rules of the street among users in conflict
- Domestic disturbances

4. Conveying Information (111)

a. To Reduce Anxiety and Fear (8)

- Providing accurate and reliable information
- Dispelling rumors
- Calming victims

b. To Enable Citizens To Solve Their Own Problems (13)

- Providing instructions on accessing government services

c. To Elicit Conformity With Laws and Regulations That Are Not Known or Understood (23)

- Explaining liability to liquor vendors
- Explaining parking regulations
- Explaining American laws to recent immigrants
- Explaining liquor laws to juveniles

d. To Warn Potential Victims About Their Vulnerability, and Advise Them of Ways To Protect Themselves (20)

- Children, about strangers, drugs, sexual assault
- Shoppers, about thefts from cars
- Elderly, about con artists
- Shoppers, about bogus merchandise
- Car owners, about auto theft

- Homeowners, about burglary
- Hotel patrons, about storing valuables and area safety

e. To Demonstrate to People How They Unwittingly Contribute to Problems (14)

- Contributing to panhandlers

f. To Develop Support for Addressing a Problem (30)

- Identifying problems about which the public is unaware
- Explaining harms of seemingly innocuous offenses

g. To Acquaint the Community With the Limitations on the Police, and To Define What the Community Can Realistically Expect of the Police (3)

- Limitations on ability to remove undesirable people from public places

5. Mobilizing the Community (30)

- Establishment of neighborhood watches
- Identification of abandoned vehicles
- Promotion of community interaction to reduce fear, mistrust or tension
- Installation of telephone notification systems to alert potential victims
- Formation of citizen patrols
- Solicitation of information on criminal activity

6. Using Existing Forms of Social Control, in Addition to the Community (38)

- Parents over children
- Teachers over students
- Landlords over tenants (residential and business)
- Employers over employees
- Contractors over subcontractors
- Universities over fraternities
- Friends over one another
- Neighbors over one another
- Youth over one another, as members of a club
- Banks over account holders
- Bar owners over patrons
- Motel/hotel owners over guests
- Businesses over private security companies
- Military commanders over soldiers

7. Altering the Physical Environment To Reduce Opportunities for Problems to Recur (57)

    - Redesigning buildings
    - Closing streets or rerouting traffic
    - Improving lighting
    - Cleaning up neighborhoods
    - Changing merchandising layouts
    - Erecting barriers
    - Greasing poles and fences
    - Relocating bus stops
    - Demolishing buildings
    - Cleaning graffiti
    - Towing abandoned vehicles
    - Removing or altering pay telephones
    - Installing metal detectors
    - Demolishing buildings
    - Using plastic rather than glass receptacles

8. Increasing Regulation, Through Statutes or Ordinances, of Conditions That Contribute to Problems (21)

    - Establishing minimum standards for locks and lighting, to reduce burglary
    - Establishing regulatory and fining schemes for false alarms
    - Establishing specific crime prevention requirements (e.g., two clerks in convenience stores)
    - Requiring soundproofing in apartment complexes
    - Restricting merchandising practices that make theft easy
    - Restricting sale of spray paint to minors

9. Developing New Forms of Limited Authority To Intervene and Detain (15)

    - Giving police power to detain without charging
    - Giving police power to make involuntary mental commitments
    - Giving police power to make involuntary detoxification commitments
    - Giving police power to conduct involuntary transports to shelters for homeless in danger
    - Establishing cite-and-release procedures
    - Securing agency authority from private property owners to enforce trespassing laws

10. Using the Criminal Justice System More Discriminately (124)

a. Straightforward Investigation, Arrest and Prosecution (45)

- Reactive investigations and arrests
- Proactive investigations and arrests

b. Selective Enforcement, With Articulated Criteria (22)

- Crackdowns (aka zero tolerance)
- High-volume traffic enforcement at select locations

c. Enforcement of Criminal Laws That, by Tradition, Are Enforced by Another Agency (12)

- Merchant fraud
- Environmental laws
- Building code violations
- Consumer protection laws
- Immigration laws

d. Greater Specification of Behavior That Should Be Subject to Criminal Prosecution or to Control Through City Ordinances (4)

- Aggressive panhandling laws
- Loitering-for-the-purpose-of-(e.g., prostitution, drug dealing) laws (efforts to refine the law to focus on specific harm, without being overbroad)

e. Intervention Without Making an Arrest (26)

- Stopping, warning, educating offenders
- Giving conspicuous warnings to offenders
- Confiscating contraband without charges
- Setting up DUI roadblocks

f. Use of Arrest Without the Intention To Prosecute (2)

- As a means to get drug users into treatment
- As a means to get batterers into counseling

g. Attachment of New Conditions to Probation or Parole (13)

- Mapping offenders out of an area
- Prohibiting contact with specific individuals

11. Using Civil Law To Control Public Nuisances, Offensive Behavior and Conditions Contributing to Crime (44)

    - Liquor licensing
    - Zoning
    - Conditional-use permits
    - Business licenses
    - Asset forfeiture
    - Padlock laws
    - Nuisance abatement
    - Restraining orders and injunctions
    - Vehicle impoundment
    - Health inspection
    - Fire code inspection
    - Building code inspection

Tables 13 and 14 list the frequency with which each of these general response categories and subcategories was reported in the projects.

Table 13
General Response Categories, by Frequency

Category No.	General Response Category	No. of Times Response Was Used
10	Using the Criminal Justice System More Discriminately	124
4	Conveying Information	111
2	Connecting With Other Government and Private Services	65
7	Altering the Physical Environment To Reduce Opportunities for Problems to Recur	57
11	Using Civil Law To Control Public Nuisances, Offensive Behavior and Conditions Contributing to Crime	44
6	Using Existing Forms of Social Control, in Addition to the Community	38
5	Mobilizing the Community	30
1	Concentrating Attention on Those Who Account for a Disproportionate Share of a Problem	25
8	Increasing Regulation, Through Statutes or Ordinances, of Conditions That Contribute to Problems	21
9	Developing New Forms of Limited Authority To Intervene and Detain	15
3	Using Mediation And Negotiation Skills	5

Note: The totals can exceed 100 because the police could use multiple subcategories in any given project.

Table 14
Response Subcategories, by Frequency

Response Subcategory No.	Response Subcategory Description	Percentage of Projects in Which Response Was Used
7	Altering the Physical Environment To Reduce Opportunities for Problems to Recur	57
10a	Straightforward Investigation, Arrest and Prosecution	45
11	Using Civil Law To Control Public Nuisances, Offensive Behavior and Conditions Contributing to Crime	44
6	Using Existing Forms of Social Control, in Addition to the Community	38
2b	Coordinating Police Responses With Other Agencies	33
4f	Conveying Information To Develop Support for Addressing a Problem	30
5	Mobilizing the Community	30
10e	Intervention Without Making an Arrest	26
1	Concentrating Attention on Those Who Account for a Disproportionate Share of a Problem	25
4c	Conveying Information To Elicit Conformity With Laws and Regulations That Are Not Known or Understood	23
2c	Correcting Inadequacies in Municipal Services, and Pressing for New Services	22
10b	Selective Enforcement, With Articulated Criteria	22
8	Increasing Regulation, Through Statutes or Ordinances, of Conditions That Contribute to Problems	21
4d	Conveying Information To Warn Potential Victims About Their Vulnerability, and Advise Them of Ways To Protect Themselves	20
9	Developing New Forms of Limited Authority To Intervene and Detain	15
4e	Conveying Information To Demonstrate to People How They Unwittingly Contribute to Problems	14
4b	Conveying Information To Enable Citizens To Solve Their Own Problems	13
10g	Attachment of New Conditions to Probation or Parole	13
10c	Enforcement of Criminal Laws That, by Tradition, Are Enforced by Another Agency	12
2a	Making Referrals to Other Agencies	10
4a	Conveying Information To Reduce Anxiety and Fear	8
3	Using Mediation And Negotiation Skills	5
10d	Greater Specification of Behavior That Should Be Subject to Criminal Prosecution or to Control Through City Ordinances	4
4g	Conveying Information To Acquaint the Community With the Limitations on the Police, and To Define What the Community Can Realistically Expect of the Police	3
10f	Use of Arrest Without the Intention To Prosecute	2

Note: Frequency is expressed as a percentage because each subcategory was recorded only once per project, even if the police used several different responses of the particular type.

As the tables above indicate, the most commonly reported type of response was some use of the criminal justice system. This was not surprising, given the police's longstanding function as enforcers of criminal law. Within that general category, straightforward investigation, arrest and prosecution was the predominant specific response category. In reading the submissions, I had the impression that, in most instances in which the police used straightforward investigation, arrest and prosecution, they used it more as the backdrop to other, more carefully developed interventions than as the primary intervention itself. It served as a reminder, both to the people whose offensive behavior was being addressed, and to the police themselves, that the most restrictive response alternative–arrest and prosecution–remained available if less-restrictive measures failed to correct the behavior. The next most common specific response category within this general category was selective enforcement, with articulated criteria. I was generous in classifying these sorts of responses in that the articulated criteria were not often explicit. This response category contained all references to "zero tolerance" criminal law enforcement; 15 submissions reported "zero tolerance" as a response strategy.

Within this general criminal justice system category were two of the least frequently reported specific response types–defining with greater specificity that behavior that should be subject to criminal prosecution or to control through city ordinances, and using arrest without the intention to prosecute. The police rarely reported drafting new legislation to target specific forms of behavior. Rather, they creatively used existing laws to fashion a response strategy. They also rarely reported making arrests without intending to prosecute, most likely because this practice appears, on the surface, to be ethically and legally problematic. In fact, carefully considered, with appropriate safeguards, this response can be effective. Drug courts and domestic violence courts frequently use this strategy to compel offenders to seek professional treatment. The unwillingness either to use this response or to admit to using it may also be attributable to the low level of prosecutor involvement in these problem-solving initiatives. For police to use this response appropriately, prosecutors should be involved in the process.

The second most frequently reported general response category was conveying information, followed by connecting with other government and private services. Like the category related to using the criminal justice system, these categories are quite broad, and so naturally encompass many of the police's specific responses. Their breadth is reflected by the subcategories Goldstein developed to better convey what these sorts of responses entail.

I found it more instructive to look at the frequency of the subcategories described in Table 14 than at the frequency of the general categories in Table 13. The frequency with which the specific response categories were reported in the submissions better reflects the degree to which the police used responses other than criminal law enforcement. The more specific breakdown reveals that the single most frequently used type of response was altering the physical environment to reduce opportunities for problems to recur. Situational-crime-prevention and crime-prevention-through-environmental-design advocates will be heartened by this finding. The police in these problem-solving initiatives demonstrated a willingness and capacity to modify the environment in which problems occurred as an effective means of modifying the behavior of offenders and potential victims. Fifteen of the submissions specifically referred to crime prevention through environmental design.

The police also relied heavily on informal social relationships as leverage to modify behavior (reflected in category 6), and use of civil law to regulate conduct (reflected in category 11). Somewhat surprisingly, there were few reports of the use of mediation, either by the police themselves or through trained professional mediators (category 3). Only one submission reported use of a strategy sometimes referred to as "restorative justice." Restorative justice, like mediation, is a form of alternative dispute resolution that is growing in popularity. I expected it to be more widely used in the projects.

While I did not record response types other than those in Goldstein's categories, I did note that the police frequently used increased surveillance as a response to many problems. Increased surveillance includes extra or conspicuous police patrols, video surveillance, police satellite offices in the problem areas, or covert police surveillance. I estimate the police used some form of increased surveillance in at least one-third of the projects, with some form of electronic surveillance (typically, through video cameras) being the most common.

The submissions reported as few as one category of response to as many as 15 categories of responses per project. Table 13 lists the distribution of the number of response categories per project. The average number of response categories used per project was five.[170] This finding partially confirms the idea that the most effective problem-solving initiatives are those that combine several types of responses. The use of multiple responses does complicate the assessment of effectiveness, as it becomes increasingly difficult to isolate the effective interventions as the number of interventions increases. This tension requires greater consideration by those interested in determining which are the best practices for various types of problems.

[170] *The mean was 5.68, the median was 5 and the mode was 5.*

Table 15
Number of Response Categories, by Number of Projects

No. of Response Categories Reported	No. of Projects
1	5
2	10
3	16
4	8
5	17
6	10
7	13
8	4
9	4
10	3
11	0
12	3
13	3
14	2
15	2
Total	**100**

Conclusion

I am not the first to analyze the Goldstein awards. In 1997, Ron Clarke, the chair of the award committee, reported on an analysis of the 88 submissions to the 1995 program.[171] Clarke and his research assistant explored the type and quality of problem analysis and assessment in greater detail than I did. In those aspects, they found the projects largely to be lacking, a finding I cannot dispute. Clarke classified projects differently than I did in several respects. First, he used somewhat different response-type categories than I did, although they, too, incorporated most of Goldstein's categories. Second, he classified the scope of problems only as either "beat level" or "jurisdiction-wide," whereas I added an intermediate category. Third, he classified projects as either "problem types" or "place types." I made no firm distinction, classifying each project in multiple ways. Finally, he classified responses as either "enforcement" or "situational," a classification I did not make.

[171] *Clarke reported his findings in an appendix to his report to the National Institute of Justice, "Problem-Oriented Policing and the Potential Contribution of Criminology," Feb. 26, 1997, and expanded on them in a chapter in Problem-Oriented Policing: Crime-Specific Problems, Critical Issues and Making POP Work, published by PERF in 1998. Several other studies have analyzed various collections of problem-solving projects, including a study of POP projects in the San Diego Police Department (Capowich and Roehl 1994), and a study of POP projects in the Leicestershire and Cleveland, England, police forces (Leigh, Read and Tilley 1998). While the precise methods and categorization schemes of the studies vary, many of the general findings are consistent. Together, the studies provide insights into the actual practice of problem-oriented policing.*

Many of Clarke's findings are consistent with mine, although he expressed more disappointment in the quality of the projects than do I.[172] (This may be partly because he analyzed only one year's worth of submissions, including many that did not survive an initial quality screening. I analyzed only the best submissions from all years.) Clarke found the same average number of responses used per project as I did–five.[173] He found similar patterns in the frequency of response types–frequent use of the criminal justice system, coordination with other government agencies and private services, and provision of information. Interestingly, he found exactly the same percentage of instances in which the police altered the physical environment to reduce opportunities for problems to recur (57%), and similar levels of the use of surveillance.

One must put both my analysis and Clarke's in their appropriate context. It is easy to find deficiencies among the projects when they are being compared to an ideal model of problem-oriented policing. What is more remarkable, in my opinion, is the high level of dedication, innovation and apparent effectiveness demonstrated by the police officers who undertook these projects. They confirm for me the real potential that lies in the problem-oriented approach to policing, an approach that, after all, is a mere 20 years old.

Each year, one or two projects are designated as winners, and several others as "finalists" or "honorable mentions."[174] There are many interesting and high-quality projects, among both those formally recognized and those not so recognized. Each judge has his or her favorites, and although the program coordinators report that the judges' scores are becoming increasingly consistent, there will always be a degree of personal preference in the judging.[175] Every one of the 100 projects I reviewed has something interesting and valuable to offer readers, and collectively, as well as individually, these projects make an important contribution to the developing body of knowledge about effective police practice.

[172]Clarke and I integrated some of our findings in a chapter in a volume on problem-oriented policing (Scott and Clarke 2000).

[173]Capowich and Roehl (1994) found that San Diego police officers used an average of seven responses per problem-solving project. Their counting rules were not necessarily the same as either mine or Clarke's, but their result is generally consistent with ours. They, too, found heavy use of environmental redesign and informal social control as response strategies.

[174]In the first few years of the program, projects were divided into "individual" and "team" projects, a distinction that has since been abolished. The "honorable mention" designation of early years has been replaced with a "finalist" designation.

[175]Among my personal favorites over the years are the Blue Hole Park project (Georgetown, Texas, 1995); the Barrow temperance project (North Slope Borough, Alaska, Department of Public Safety, 1995); the New Helvetia and River Oaks project (Sacramento, Calif., Police Department, 1996); the Elite Arcade project (Delta, British Columbia, Police Department, 1997); the domestic violence revictimization prevention project (Fremont, Calif., Police Department, 1997); the day laborer project (Glendale, Calif., Police Department, 1997); the street cruising project (Santa Ana, Calif., Police Department, 1997); Operation Cease-Fire (Boston Police Department, 1998); the Transient Enrichment Network (Fontana, Calif., Police Department, 1998); "Operation Hot Pipe, Smokey Haze and Rehab" (San Diego Police Department, 1998); and "Street Sweeping, Broadway Style" (Green Bay, Wisc., Police Department, 1999).

Appendix B: A Partial List of Problem-Focused Literature

The following is a partial list of problem-focused publications that were published either by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), or by police research organizations, with funding from OJP agencies. By the term, "problem-focused," I mean only that the subject matter of the publication is a substantive community problem, not that it was necessarily a product of Goldstein's model of problem-oriented research. Some of these publications describe actual problem-oriented policing efforts; some merely provide information about the nature and scope of a problem, without assessing any intervention efforts. It is not a comprehensive list, but rather reflects a review of recent publication lists put out by these agencies. The list is meant to illustrate, in a general way, the sort of research publications that reflect the kind of substantive focus that Herman Goldstein advocates in problem-oriented policing.

U.S. Department of Justice-Sponsored

Bureau of Justice Assistance

Addressing Community Gang Problems: A Model For Problem-Solving

Addressing Community Gang Problems: A Practical Guide

The BJA Firearms Trafficking Program: Demonstrating Effective Strategies To Control Violent Crime

Developing a Strategy for a Multiagency Response to Clandestine Drug Laboratories

Strategies for Reducing Homicide: The Comprehensive Homicide Initiative in Richmond, California

National Institute of Justice

Arrestees and Guns: Monitoring the Illegal Firearms Market

Batterer Programs: What Criminal Justice Agencies Need To Know

Confronting Domestic Violence: A Guide for Criminal Justice Agencies

Controlling Drug and Disorder Problems: Oakland's Beat Health Program

Crime, Grime, Fear, and Decline: A Longitudinal Look

Crime in the Schools: Reducing Conflict With Student Problem-Solving

The Crime of Stalking: How Big Is the Problem?

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in Parking Facilities

The D.A.R.E. Program: A Review of Prevalence, User Satisfaction and Effectiveness

"Designing Out" Gang Homicides and Street Assaults

Evaluation of Violence Prevention Programs in Middle Schools

The Expanding Role of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in Premises Liability

Fraud Control in the Health Care Industry: Assessing the State of the Art

Juvenile Gun Violence and Gun Markets in Boston

The Kansas City Gun Experiment

Modern Policing and the Control of Illegal Drugs: Testing New Strategies in Two American Cities

Police Problem-Solving Strategies for Dealing With Youth and Gang-Related Firearms (ongoing study)

The Police Response to Gangs: A Multisite Study (ongoing study)

Police Response to Special Populations (Handling the Mentally Ill, the Public Inebriate and the Homeless)

Policing Drug Hot Spots

Preventing Gang- and Drug-Related Witness Intimidation

Proceedings of the Homicide Research Working Group Meetings, 1997 and 1998

Reducing Crime and Drug Dealing by Improving Place Management: A Randomized Experiment

Reducing Violent Crimes and Intentional Injuries

Revictimization: Reducing the Heat on Hot Victims

Solving Crime Problems in Residential Neighborhoods: Comprehensive Changes in Design, Management and Use

Stalking in America: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey

Threat Assessment: An Approach To Prevent Targeted Violence

Trends, Risks and Interventions in Lethal Violence: Proceedings of the Third Annual Spring Symposium of the Homicide Research Working Group

Understanding and Preventing Violence

Violence Among Middle School and High School Students: Analysis and Implications for Prevention

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Environmental Approaches to Reducing Underage Drinking

Strategies to Reduce Underage Alcohol Use: Typology and Brief Overview

Promising Strategies To Reduce Gun Violence

Safe Start–Child Development–Community-Oriented Policing

Police Executive Research Forum

A Time for Dignity: Police and Domestic Abuse of the Elderly

Dispute Resolution and Policing: A Collaborative Approach Toward Effective Problem-Solving

Fighting Fear: The Baltimore County COPE Project

Finding and Addressing Repeat Burglaries

Illegal Money Laundering: A Strategy and Resource Guide for Law Enforcement Agencies

Improving the Police Response to Domestic Elder Abuse

Mental Illness: Police Response

Police and Drug Control: A Home Field Advantage

Police Antidrug Tactics: New Approaches and Applications

The Police Response to Gangs: Case Studies of Five Cities

The Police Response to People With Mental Illnesses: Trainer's Guide

The Police Response to People With Speech and Hearing Disabilities: Trainer's Guide

The Police Response to the Homeless: A Status Report

Problem-Oriented Policing: Crime-Specific Problems, Critical Issues and Making POP Work

Problem-Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News

Special Care: Improving the Police Response to the Mentally Disabled

Strategies for Success: Combating Juvenile DUI

Tackling Drug Problems in Public Housing

Take Another Look: Police Response to People With Seizures and Epilepsy

Toy Guns: Involvement in Crime and Encounters With Police

Under Fire: Gun Buy-Backs, Exchanges and Amnesty Programs

Police Foundation

Arresting Shoplifters: An Experiment in Lesser Crimes and Sanctions

Creating the Multidisciplinary Response to Child Sex Abuse: Implementation Guide

Domestic Violence and the Police: Studies in Detroit and Kansas City

Drug Enforcement in Public Housing: Signs of Success in Denver

Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Summary Report

Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment

Newark Foot Patrol Experiment

The Police and Interpersonal Conflict: Third-Party Intervention Approaches

Reducing Fear of Crime in Houston and Newark: A Summary Report

Spouse Abuse Research Raises New Questions About Police Response to Domestic Violence

Other Publications Listed by the National Criminal Justice Reference Service

Case Studies of Community Antidrug Efforts

Mental Illness and Violent Crime

National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T.

A Policymaker's Guide to Hate Crimes

Stopping Hate Crime: A Case History From the Sacramento Police Department

British Home Office-Sponsored

Alcohol and Crime: Taking Stock

Armed Robbery: Two Police Responses

Arresting Evidence: Domestic Violence and Repeat Victimisation

Burglary Prevention: Early Lessons From the Crime Reduction Programme

Clubs, Drugs and Doormen

Hot Products: Understanding, Anticipating and Reducing Demand for Stolen Goods

Keeping Track? Observations on Sex Offender Registers in the U.S.

Missing Presumed…? The Police Response to Missing Persons

The Nature and Extent of Construction Plant Theft

The Nature and Extent of Light Commercial Vehicle Theft

New Heroin Outbreaks Amongst Young People in England and Wales

Opportunity Makes the Thief: Practical Theory for Crime Prevention

Police Antidrugs Strategies: Tackling Drugs Together Three Years On

Policing Drug Hot Spots

Policing Problem Housing Estates

Preventing Repeat Victimisation: The Police Officer's Guide

Preventing Residential Burglary in Cambridge: From Crime Audits to Targeted Strategies

Repeat Victimisation: Taking Stock

Tackling Local Drug Markets

Tackling Street Robbery: A Comparative Evaluation of Operation Eagle Eye

Theft, Stolen Goods and the Market-Reduction Approach: Operation Radium and Operation Heat

Vehicle Crime Reduction: Turning the Corner

Appendix C: A Summary of Interviews With Selected Problem-Oriented Policing Practitioners and Researchers

To inform my writing of this report, I interviewed selected experts with extensive knowledge about, and experience with, problem-oriented policing. I initially identified 44 people who, in my estimation, have a thorough grasp of the concept of problem-oriented policing (hardly a complete list). Over the course of a year, I spoke with 30 of them at varying lengths about problem-oriented policing, and conducted a structured interview with 12 of them. The following are excerpted responses to my questions regarding problem-oriented policing, quoted from the following:

John Eck: Currently an associate criminal justice professor at the University of Cincinnati. Formerly the evaluation coordinator for the Washington, D.C./Baltimore High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, vice president of the Crime Control Research Corp. and associate director for research at the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). Has published extensively on problem-oriented policing.

Bob Heimberger: Currently a sergeant and special assistant to the chief of police in the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department. Has provided extensive training and technical assistance in problem-oriented policing, and has directed problem-oriented policing initiatives in St. Louis.

David Kennedy: Currently a senior researcher at the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Oversees the National Institute of Justice's (NIJ's) Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative. Has published on problem-oriented policing, and directed the research component of Operation Cease-Fire, a collaborative effort with the Boston Police Department to reduce youth gang violence.

Gloria Laycock: Currently the director of the Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science, School of Public Policy, University College London and recently a visiting fellow at NIJ. Formerly head of the Home Office Policing and Reducing Crime Unit in London. Has conducted extensive research on police practices, particularly crime prevention strategies and tactics, and has edited the Home Office's police research papers for a number of years.

Nancy McPherson: Currently an administrator at the Portland, Ore. Police Bureau and formerly the director of the Community and Information Services Bureau for the Seattle Police Department, the manager of neighborhood policing for the city of San Diego, and a

field advisor to the San Diego Police Department for PERF. Has provided extensive training and technical assistance in problem-oriented policing. Received the Gary P. Hayes Award for innovation in policing in 1999.

Dennis Nowicki: Currently the director of the Center for Public Service and Leadership at Pfeiffer University in Charlotte, N.C. Formerly the chief of police at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department and the Joliet, Ill., Police Department. Has published on problem-oriented policing, and has implemented problem-oriented policing practices in police agencies.

Dan Reynolds: Currently a deputy chief at the Savannah, Ga., Police Department. Has provided extensive training and technical assistance in problem-oriented policing, and has implemented problem-oriented policing practices in a police agency.

Rana Sampson: Currently a police consultant, operating as Community Policing Associates in San Diego. Formerly the director of public safety at the University of San Diego, a senior researcher at PERF, and a sergeant with the New York City Police Department. Has published on problem-oriented policing, and has implemented problem-oriented policing practices in a public safety agency.

Malcolm Sparrow: Currently a professor of practice at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. Formerly a detective chief inspector in the British Police Service. Coauthor of *Beyond 911: A New Era for Policing.* Author of *Imposing Duties: Government's Changing Approach to Compliance,* and *The Regulatory Craft: Controlling Risks, Solving Problems and Managing Compliance* (forthcoming).

Darrel Stephens: Currently the chief of police at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department. Formerly the city administrator of St. Petersburg, Fla.; the chief of police at the St. Petersburg Police Department; the executive director of PERF; and the chief of police at the Newport News, Va., Police Department and the Largo, Fla., Police Department. Has published on problem-oriented policing, and has implemented problem-oriented policing practices in police agencies.

1. Do you still consider problem-oriented policing a viable approach to improving police service?

John Eck: Yes, there really is no alternative. The problem-oriented policing label will come and go, but if the police don't embrace problem-oriented policing, they risk becoming a marginalized public service agency, as has happened to other agencies. The police need to

get on board with problem-oriented policing, or some of their functions may be taken over by other sectors, leaving only a narrow role of report taking and patrolling.

David Kennedy: Yes. Seemingly intractable crime and disorder problems remain that way because we continue to do the same things that don't work. Sustained thinking works. The basic framework of the President's Crime Commission of 1968 remains in place today–the use of the criminal justice system as the main crime control mechanism. Most major reform efforts are merely efforts to improve the functioning of that system. The criminal justice system may be suited for individual justice, but it is not well-suited for reducing crime.

Gloria Laycock: Yes. I've seen it work, so, de facto, it's viable. We now know it's deliverable at some level in policing. Whether that means it's deliverable across a whole agency, as I originally thought it would be, I'm not sure, at least not in a short time frame.

Dennis Nowicki: Yes, definitely. In some ways, all the attention given to the "problem-oriented policing movement" is much to do about nothing. Despite the fanfare, problem-oriented policing is really just a common-sense approach to policing. I don't see any other way of doing our business. It results in a much clearer purpose for the activities police officers should be and are engaged in. Most social services should be done this way.

Dan Reynolds: The problem-solving process is universal, and has been throughout time. It's logical and rational. It should always have been used in policing. The education system perhaps has not done a good job inculcating problem-solving as a mental process. The sense of emergency in policing has crowded out our capacity to think about problems in the long term. I am seeing changes in the style of discussion in policing, even in our staff meetings. We talk in terms of problem-solving all kinds of issues.

Rana Sampson: Yes. Problem-oriented policing is not a panacea to all public safety problems, but it is more effective than what we've been doing. Research has demonstrated the success of using analysis to help the police develop and use less-blunt instruments for addressing problems–if not for the total elimination of problems, at least to reduce them. Problem-oriented policing is a larger concept than mere problem-solving. It has tremendous ramifications for the structure of police organizations.

Malcolm Sparrow: Yes, absolutely. I see how difficult it is to implement, but I see it as critical to improving police operations, and

to controlling a whole range of large public safety problems. The problem-oriented approach has rich potential, but still, little of that potential has been discovered.

Darrel Stephens: Absolutely. The rationale underlying it is just as sound as it ever was. Most of police work is repetitive, and the experiences applying a problem-oriented approach to repetitive problems have so far been positive. Problem-oriented policing is more effective than mere reliance on the criminal justice system. Adaptations to the concept have been made. Herman Goldstein's original concept was more centralized. I don't think he saw police officers making direct contributions to problem-solving; he saw them more as resources to analysts and researchers. Newport News and Baltimore County showed that police officers can do problem-solving themselves. I know Herman has had mixed feelings about this. Problem-oriented policing hasn't progressed as much as I would have hoped, though.

2. What aspect of the problem-oriented policing movement over the past 20 years has most impressed you?

John Eck: It's sort of like the talking-horse phenomenon: It's not how well it talks, but that it talks at all, that's impressive. The fact that we still talk about problem-oriented policing at all is a testament to its staying power. Many people are still interested in and still struggling with the concept. It has had a lot of subtle influences on police thinking. The police are more likely to look outside their departments for help today, and more interested in using data to make decisions.

Bob Heimberger: The national attention the process has received. Problem-oriented policing has given communities hope that their police can be effective. But all the federal money and the popularity of community policing have also hurt the movement; they have led to lots of small, poorly implemented programs that may be determined to have failed.

David Kennedy: The string of wins since the early to mid-1980s. There have been good, concrete examples of effective problem-solving that came out of such places as Newport News, Houston and Tampa. Tough problems were addressed using this model. It has always been clear there was juice behind the concept.

Gloria Laycock: Its ability to deliver outcomes, bottom-line outcomes such as the reduction of crime. Problem-oriented policing is an idea that was ahead of its time. Twenty years isn't the relevant period of time in the United Kingdom, because Herman Goldstein didn't become relevant until more recently. Engagement with problem-

oriented policing in the U.K. really came about after the Harvard Executive Sessions on Community Policing, and then, only in the Metropolitan Police Department in London. It was not widespread. Independently, we in the Home Office were developing something called the preventive process, which paralleled the SARA model and had been developed from the early 1980s, although we applied it only to crime prevention. After I read Herman's book, I saw we were doing some of the same things. This reinforced many of our ideas related to crime prevention.

The SARA model has been very useful, even though I recognize its drawbacks and limitations. The police like formulas and acronyms that guide them toward action. The SARA model and the crime triangle are now used widely in the U.K.

At its best, problem-oriented policing engages police officers at the front end, and gets them excited about their work. It gives them a whole new perspective on their job, such that the job can become exciting instead of routine, and that's important. Some of the junior officers are way ahead of their superiors in their comprehension of the concept. It isn't necessary to have the entire agency embracing problem-oriented policing at this point. One can find good applications of it at the individual level in just about any agency. It's really not at the agency level, but at the individual level where one is impressed by the development of the idea.

Nancy McPherson: The concept provides a clear focus on crime and disorder, as opposed to administrative matters or politics. But many police agencies haven't really focused on this. Few police organizations have really made the organizational changes necessary to support problem-solving. Two of the most positive impacts of problem-oriented policing have been the inspiration it has provided to police officers to do good work–they see the positive results from their problem-solving–and community members see it as more than fluff, as an approach that actually makes a difference on problems they care about.

Dennis Nowicki: The way the concept has been embraced by the community. Problem-oriented policing is not just a police initiative. In some cities, there is a critical mass of support for this way of policing that didn't exist 20 years ago. Although the concept is not always well-understood by most elected and other government officials, its essence is increasingly clear to neighborhood residents who step forward to work with the police officer. Because of the lack of understanding by politicians, problem-oriented policing is vulnerable; those who co-opt the label and turn it into something else can kill it.

The relationships built through working with the community to solve problems have allowed the police to survive some tough times as a result of things like controversial shootings, etc.

Dan Reynolds: Developing a relationship with the public, sharing information, working with others. Problem-oriented policing has enabled these things because the problem-solving process requires these things be done in order to gather information. And this process of gathering and sharing information has helped break down some stereotypes the police had of some members of the public. Many police officers began to realize that dispatchers aren't the only or best source of information about what's happening on the street. We are now sharing information with the community more freely than we ever did.

Rana Sampson: Problem-oriented policing has made police officers and administrators think more about the substance of their work. That sounds obvious, but we've been so blinded by so many other things that happen in the community, and by administrative responsibilities, that we haven't developed the expertise needed to address problems. Our conventional instruments were so blunt–citations, arrests, etc. The potential is immense. The analysis of problems by police officers in some projects is impressive, and their responses, creative. Herman Goldstein recognized how creative officers are. Problem-oriented policing allows for that creativity; it is no longer just something that is exercised when the sergeant isn't looking. When a police department takes a problem-oriented policing approach, it turns police work upside down by asking whether the current response is working. It calls for a constant reexamination of what we do, including our relationship with the community. So much of police work previously was bluffing. Problem-oriented policing professionalizes policing in a real sense.

Problem-oriented policing has the capacity to redefine policing away from the view that it's merely the entry point to the criminal justice system. That's incredibly significant, and recognizing it helps us have a real impact on problems. This hasn't occurred to any great extent yet, but it is beginning. Police chiefs and the U.S. Department of Justice haven't fully engaged with this fact. It also calls for a whole new education of judges and prosecutors about the role of the police.

Malcolm Sparrow: The visible successes have been at the beat level, where problem-solving appears as a natural companion to community policing. Compared with other regulatory professions, the police have led the way in the early articulation and implementation of the problem-oriented approach. The police, however, have since run into

a specific obstacle, which is their general failure to construct the managerial systems that are required to run problem-solving at higher levels, and as the core of police operations.

Darrel Stephens: I'm impressed with even the small proportion of police officers who have made problem-oriented policing part of their work. A lot of good work has been done. The concept is broad-based in some police departments, and the results have been impressive. It's been demonstrated in lots of different departments. The implementation of the concept at present is wide, but not deep.

3. What aspect of the problem-oriented policing movement over the past 20 years has most disappointed you?

John Eck: As Gary Cordner has pointed out, the linkages between analysis and response are the weakest. Many people have difficulty conceptualizing information. This problem is not restricted to the police; it's a human problem. Other professions have similar difficulty translating research knowledge into practice.

Some efforts, like exploring the proper structure for a police agency, are likely to have only a marginal impact on problem-oriented policing, and on improving police service.

I am also very much disappointed with the police profession, national organizations and academia for not advancing problem-oriented policing beyond where we were in 1985. We have many more police agencies and officers involved in problem-solving, and there are many exceptional efforts at addressing problems. But for the most part, no one has taken what was done by Herman Goldstein or by the Newport News Police Department and expanded upon it in any substantial manner. Academics have criticized various ways problem-oriented policing has been implemented, and this is good, but with rare exception, they have not attempted to build a better mousetrap. National agencies have promulgated much of the original work, but have not looked for ways of improving problem analysis. Police agencies have adopted aspects of a problem-oriented approach, but have focused more on the management of the organization than on trying to understand the problems their officers face.

Bob Heimberger: The lack of understanding of the concept, including what outcomes are desired. The concept often gets confused with efforts to improve community relations. The follow-up in training programs didn't occur. We needed more resources from funding agencies to help with evaluation. But many auditors from funding agencies knew less about the methodology than the department receiving the funds. Anything can be made to look successful. It has been too easy to get and keep the money.

David Kennedy: Since the early 1990s, it has been frustrating that, after 10 years, most problem-solving efforts remained small local efforts by line officers, not intermediate or communitywide sorts of problems. Not much has been done on serious crime, mostly on disorder and fear. There has been little engagement by police management, and little structural change in police agencies. There is a strong need to improve agencies' data gathering and analysis capacities. There is a need to get mid-managers more involved. With the exception, perhaps, of the San Diego Police Department, problem-oriented policing has not become normal policing yet. These frustrations prompted many of the features of the Boston funding proposal to NIJ (Operation Cease-Fire). We wanted to raise the bar. Some of these things are changing a bit, but they remain largely true today.

Gloria Laycock: The time frame it takes to get these ideas developed and implemented in police agencies. One of the strengths of the concept is its simplicity, so it's hard to understand why it's so difficult for some people and agencies to do it. Some police agencies are very unimaginative, and that's disappointing. Those who struggle with the concept tend not to appreciate the value of data, the time it takes to make use of it, and the patience required to reflect on the real nature of problems. That's largely a product of police training–they want to get on with things quickly. Police chiefs have been slow to take this up, and they have fewer excuses than line officers. It's hard to get chiefs to concentrate on the concept long enough to make it work; they seem preoccupied with local political problems, which is in itself understandable, but points to a fairly basic problem in the whole system of policing.

Problem-oriented policing is fundamentally rational; it is the scientific method applied to policing. It should be self-evident that it is needed. Unfortunately, there isn't enough fundamental rationality in policing.

Nancy McPherson: The lip service paid to the concept for political reasons, and lack of a real commitment to the principles of problem-oriented policing. There has not been enough technology developed or implemented to support line people in their problem-solving efforts.

Dennis Nowicki: The lack of understanding of what this is all about. Public policymakers and the uninvolved public develop their view of policing from watching TV cop shows. We haven't communicated the core elements sufficiently and consistently enough for them. Our deficiencies in selling the concept mean that even many police officers don't have a common understanding of what is expected of them.

Dan Reynolds: I thought we would be doing more problem-oriented policing projects, that there would be more outcomes. Problem-oriented policing is harder to sustain than I imagined, to get beyond the sense that this is a fad. When we started into problem-oriented policing in the early '90s, I thought implementation would take one year. Yet we're still teaching it. We measure our progress, in part, by how many problem-oriented policing projects we've undertaken, though I realize this is a dubious measure. We probably underestimated the resistance of the police culture, and we should have attended more to changing the culture before seeking complete implementation of problem-oriented policing.

Reactive policing is so much easier. Police officers are trained to prefer order to disorder, and problem-solving seems, to some officers, to be creating disorder, to be upsetting the balance of things.

My expectations of problem-oriented policing have changed over time. I'm not as frustrated about the pace of change now. It's interesting to hear how new these ideas are still to some people, and in some places in the country. Some of us sort of assumed that if we knew this stuff, everyone else did. That just isn't true. In a strange way, perhaps the complexity of the drug problem has forced the police to become more sophisticated in analyzing the related problems and looking for new solutions. It certainly has fueled the money that has gone into training, research and technology, much of which has supported problem-oriented policing. It may have been a blessing in disguise for the police profession.

Rana Sampson: Most chiefs have not taken the time to understand Goldstein's concept. Most chiefs probably haven't even read Goldstein's book once, and it is worth reading many times. So police organizations haven't invested in learning it. Many have taken the easier path of community policing projects and Compstat.

Malcolm Sparrow: The practice of problem-solving seems to have stalled, partly because it has not been sufficiently distinguished from its frequent companion (community policing), and has therefore been viewed by many police agencies as a question of professional style for beat-level officers, and not a central challenge for the departmental management structure. So larger problems tend not to get addressed in a problem-oriented fashion. Problem-solving can be done at the field level without making systematic or structural changes to the police organization, or to its various administrative and managerial systems. There has been a tendency to simplify and reduce the problem-solving concept, and to focus on particular innovations rather than the systems and managerial behaviors that produced them.

This tendency is by no means unique to the police.

Some problems that the police must address don't lend themselves to the sort of community partnership responses envisioned by community policing, and for those kinds of problems, problem-solving has been less well-developed. Those problems nonetheless are amenable to problem-solving interventions.

Problem-solving seems to happen more naturally at both the bottom and top levels of police organizations. But it's not satisfactory that it happen at only these levels, since most problems we care about are intermediate-size problems, calling for intermediate-level responses, organized and coordinated within the middle layers of police organizations.

Darrel Stephens: I'm fairly disappointed it hasn't become more of what police officers do on a daily basis. Most problem-solving that gets done is additional activity. Both the community and the police see the criminal justice response as the primary one to crime problems, and other matters are viewed as mere annoyances. The public has maintained a high level of confidence in the criminal justice system. Police work is still defined narrowly, in spite of efforts to expand it. A few chiefs have gone very far in implementing problem-oriented policing, but most have been more limited in their efforts. It is still not mainstream policing. It remains a small proportion of the total investment in policing.

Community leaders still cling to the idea that government and the police can and will solve all their problems, and they tend not to want to take responsibility for solving their own problems. There have been a few exceptional efforts. On the whole, most city managers and mayors remain ignorant of this concept. In some places, good problem-solving occurs outside of, and in spite of, the local government framework. In such places, there is little political buy-in. Buy-in tends to be tied to the energy and commitment of the police chief, not the elected officials.

Problem-oriented policing likely will remain concentrated among certain kinds of police chiefs, and in certain communities. A good economy has relieved some of the pressure to do policing differently. There is less fiscal pressure on the criminal justice system. The New York experience has been detrimental to the concept; it's had a bigger impact than I imagined it would. They are doing some analysis of problems in New York, but then applying conventional responses–presence, pressure, intimidation by the police.

4. What information technology have you seen that has enhanced problem-oriented policing?

John Eck: There is lots of information technology, now that industry has discovered marketable products. Mapping software is abundant. A lot of this information technology will not be particularly helpful, but some will be. I can't predict where this development will go. I love maps and feel that computer mapping can improve the way police address problems. However, the major barriers to improving problem-oriented policing are not technological. They have to do with how we conceptualize crime and disorder problems. The risk with technology is that it often allows us to continue doing what we always did poorly, rather than spurring us to new ways of seeing things.

Bob Heimberger: The websites of the COPS Office and the Community Policing Consortium made research and the exchange of information easier. Laptops in police cars raised the awareness that police officers need data on the streets. But there has been too much flying by the seat of the pants in developing this technology; there is no good central repository of information.

Gloria Laycock: Computer technology like computerized mapping can help the police manage the enormous volumes of data they possess. This has been the best contribution of technology. Mapping, however, is actually a bit of a red herring. It can even be unhelpful. I worry that people are becoming obsessed with maps and their pretty colors, without thinking much about what information they contain or what can be learned from them. The technology itself becomes what is fascinating, rather than the knowledge to be gained from it. So technology can at times inhibit the development of problem-oriented policing, because it stops people from thinking.

Nancy McPherson: Crime mapping, at least to get people focused on hot spots and series-of-crime analysis. The Seattle Police Department is now trying to get some recently declassified Central Intelligence Agency technology that will enable things like link analyses.

Dan Reynolds: The Internet, with its many websites that allow us to share and gather information about common problems, and potential strategies and solutions. The National Criminal Justice Reference Service's website, for example, is a good source of information.

Every police officer in our department now has access to computer technology–if not for all functions, at least to be able to gather data from our records systems and from other information databases.

Malcolm Sparrow: I don't think information technology has been used the way it needs to be. Geographic mapping has helped in hot-spot analysis, as have software programs like STAC (Spatial and Temporal Analysis of Crime), but they are specific and limited forms of analysis. We need a much broader array of analytical techniques, built on top of flexible data access systems such as data warehouses. I describe in greater detail the needs and the possibilities for applying information technology to problem-solving in my book *Imposing Duties,* particularly chapter 4.

Darrel Stephens: There have been lots of attempts, but not much result. Computerized mapping and data systems to allow police to assess calls for service have been useful. There's been far more promise than delivery.

5. How well has research supported problem-oriented policing?

John Eck: This is highly variable for individual researchers and institutions. Some are very good. Few researchers are genuinely interested in applied policing, though. It's difficult for a young academic to balance a research agenda with a firm grounding in reality. Research contributions likely will have to come from the academic community, or they won't come at all. Private industry has a stronger history of engaging in sound in-house research than does the public sector, including the police.

We need to preserve diversity of thinking in policing. To some degree, the federal funding programs have promoted homogeneity of thought, and that's something to be careful of. We shouldn't expect brilliant ideas to come out of government. It isn't what it does best. Tying federal money to ideas about policing tends to promote fads more so than it promotes solid ideas. Smaller experiments with a variety of ideas that others can adopt voluntarily tend to work better.

Bob Heimberger: The real influence has come from individuals rather than research institutions. Bill Spelman and John Eck's writings have been very influential. Lots of researchers are engaged in the subject more for personal and financial interests than to improve policing.

David Kennedy: First, one must distinguish the research *on* problem-oriented policing from the research *in* problem-oriented policing. There has been some good operational research on substantive problems done out of universities such as Rutgers. Among the SACSI sites funded by NIJ, most are new to this methodology. I don't see much research relevant to problem-oriented policing coming out of some of the other top criminology schools, however. Among

researchers, this sort of work is not professionally valued. This is true more for cultural than principled reasons. Policy analysis is looked down on by the social sciences. There is no place to publish it in the respected journals. Some see this type of research as too basic. It requires field research to gather relevant data, rather than relying on existing data sets. There remain cultural barriers between scholars, cops and the community. Doing problem-oriented policing well requires a level of understanding of problems and agencies' capacities that is often lacking. This is needed for researchers to understand what value might realistically be produced. What many researchers know how to do isn't always useful to problem-oriented research. Basic social science training and the social science mindset are about two fundamental questions: How did this happen?–which explores causal factors–and, What does this look like?–which is descriptive. Problem-solving research is about useful interventions.

Gloria Laycock: I'd like to think the work we've done in the Home Office in the U.K. has been useful, even though all of it wasn't always done under the rubric of problem-oriented policing. In the United States, NIJ and the COPS Office have led the way, though in those agencies, problem-oriented policing has become muddled with community policing. They've spent lots of money in the area, but haven't yet produced the results out the other end. PERF has supported the POP conference, but I think they could have done a lot more.

6. What are the next steps the profession should take to advance problem-oriented policing?

John Eck: If the public demands better police service, the police will likely provide it. But demand is a very localized thing, and demand isn't always expressed in a very clear or sophisticated fashion. Where there are good police leaders, they can help translate that demand into better policing.

The police need to take criminology more seriously, and criminologists need to shift some of their focus away from explaining why people become criminals, and toward reducing criminal opportunities. Environmental criminology has a lot to offer the police.

Bob Heimberger: We need to improve our understanding of the concept, including the management issues for police commanders. I'm hesitant, however, to say just provide more training. We need closer follow-up by funding and research agencies to keep initiatives on track. There needs to be more research on substantive community problems to improve the police understanding of complex problems.

There remains a lot of misunderstanding among police about problems like homicide. More money for more police on the streets isn't necessarily the answer.

David Kennedy: The profession needs to promote examples and models of what it wants done. So it needs a deliberate process of supporting, assisting and guiding this work. SACSI is such an effort, and the COMPASS program incorporates information technology. We need to create the next round of stories. We should create a list of substantive problems we want addressed, like domestic violence, robbery, burglary, and child abuse, and then target the best agencies and researchers in the problem-oriented policing field, and provide them with lots of coaching. We need to think about the desirable institutional features of police departments, like their internal research capacity and their problem identification abilities. We need a journal to publish this kind of work. The *Journal of the American Medical Association* started out as doctors writing stories. There has been a large failure of leadership among police executives.

Gloria Laycock: Documentation of what works is needed, teasing out the specific mechanisms by which certain interventions to certain problems have proven effective. A more systematic training effort is needed to get the concept into the consciousness of police officers. There also needs to be a valid and reliable performance regime developed. Measuring what matters is crucial here. I do not think the current trend in focusing at the individual officer level will work. I would look at the precinct or district level, and hold district commanders accountable for reducing the number or seriousness of hot spots in their areas. "Solving" trivial problems–single issues–would be discouraged.

Nancy McPherson: Focus on accountability at the commander level. While New York's Compstat and Los Angeles' FastTrack models are not the direction the Seattle Police Department wants to go, we are looking at command accountability processes. We need processes that get beyond just Part I crimes and the public humiliation of commanders. Organizations need to carefully craft these processes; they can take them down the wrong path quickly. Line officers often say they are not supported by higher-ups, so this needs serious attention.

We need to get police investigators more engaged in problem-solving. Performance evaluations should emphasize collegial, coaching feedback. We need improved training for police supervision. We should promote integrated criminal justice systems, including linked records and data with courts and other police agencies.

Dennis Nowicki: We need to aggressively educate the public on what effective policing has come to be. We need to give police officers and the community the information tools they need to do problem-oriented policing. All local governments need to develop a problem focus. This evolution is underway; we're starting to see neighborhood services, prosecutors, and probation and parole get involved. We need problems to become the basic units of work in policing and other city services, and to make that idea real. We need organizational structures and systems to become better aligned with the problem-oriented policing concept. Remember, this process of change toward problem-oriented policing has not been sustained for 20 years within any one agency. There is lots of inconsistent change within police departments. We don't have critical mass yet throughout the country, but it does exist in a few departments. The organizational structure of police agencies tends to reflect the individual personalities of the chiefs. The potential end of COPS Office funding will create a small crisis in the field; it will give some people and agencies an excuse not to engage in problem-oriented policing. This may not happen, but if it does, it could be devastating.

Dan Reynolds: There is a need to focus on reorganizing police departments more substantially. We should consider creating units and functions we might not have had before. We need to continue to decentralize police operations to enable officers to work more closely with the community. We need stronger information technology units within police departments. We need to exploit technological means by which we can get information out to the public about crime and problems, to solicit their support and assistance. Reverse-911 technology, through which we can place directed automated phone calls to residences or businesses about specific crimes or problems, is an example of this sort of technology.

Rana Sampson: There is a need to do things on several different levels. We need more victimization research. We need to collect a body of research on how to affect particular problems. The National Institute of Justice needs to rethink how to research problems and get information out in a timely fashion. There are people who can do this. The federal government needs to invest in situational crime prevention research, and make it accessible to police officers. Ninety-nine percent of police officers have never seen a *Research in Brief*. There is a need to better understand the research audience–line police officers. We need more written about how the police are not just the entry to the criminal justice system.

Police departments need to invest in their internal research capabilities. Smaller agencies should pool resources toward this end. Research units can't and shouldn't do all the work in problem-oriented policing, but

they should do problem-solving of a different type than beat-level problem-solving, and should engage in some experimentation. There is a need to do work on situational crime prevention and victims. We don't even know how many crimes occur, because most aren't reported. We need to take a broader view of police responsibilities, in addition to solving reported crimes.

There is a need for more research into criminals' perceptions of their work–like Scott Decker and Richard Wright's work on burglars. We need better research on deterrence and opportunity reduction, picking up on the work of Marcus Felson and Ron Clarke. We need to better understand criminogenic places. Urban planners know very little about crime–police and urban planners need to get better connected. University faculty need to get more engaged in local crime problems.

Police, social service, code enforcement, and mental health agencies must learn to share information, especially regarding the repeat nature of people and places.

Cities need to develop an understanding of, and an explicitness about, the responsibilities of businesses that consume a disproportionate volume of police services–like convenience stores and shopping malls–social responsibilities of companies not to create crime opportunities.

There is a need for more and better training for crime analysts, to make them more than people who input data, and better training for officers to analyze the data.

Malcolm Sparrow: We need to prescribe more definitively what administrative arrangements work best to support problem-oriented policing *above* the beat level.

I would like to see problem-oriented policing draw more from the fields of intelligence analysis. The concept of intelligence-led policing, which one finds primarily in the United Kingdom and Canada (and emerging in some places in the United States), represents some movement toward organizing police operations around analysis of the issues they face, but this movement still remains somewhat disconnected from the development of problem-oriented policing. The International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts, led by Marilyn Peterson, is trying to connect problem-oriented policing with intelligence-led policing.

I have been studying the operations and management of a number of other risk control operations, such as environmental protection, customs, occupational safety and health, and tax collection. Like the

police, these agencies are essentially regulatory enterprises. Unfortunately, the police don't view themselves as "regulators," so they miss some opportunities to connect with and learn from a broad range of colleagues in other regulatory bodies. I focus on those parallels in *The Regulatory Craft* [Sparrow, forthcoming]. The central thesis of that book is that problem-solving has enormous potential across the entire regulatory side of government, including policing, and, for reasons we are only beginning to understand, this extraordinary potential has not yet been realized.

Darrel Stephens: I'm not sure. The concept will advance among those who have had positive experiences with problem-oriented policing. Without external pressure, though, it may not happen, especially if doing conventional police work is easier. When the economy turns down, and crime goes back up, there may be more pressure to adopt the problem-oriented approach. External pressure is more powerful than internal desire.